



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/732,627	12/08/2000	Karen L. Fincher	38-21(51770)B	8885

7590

05/03/2002

Lawrence M. Lavin, Jr.
Monsanto Company
Patent Department, E2NA
800 N. Lindbergh Boulevard
St. Louis, MO 63167

EXAMINER

CLOW, LORI A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1631

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2002

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/732,627

Applicant(s)

FINCHER, KAREN L.

Examiner

Lori A. Clow, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2-9 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) 6.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Restriction/Election Requirement

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121:

I. Claims 1, drawn to polynucleotides and compositions containing same, classified in Class 536, subclass 23.1; Class 435, subclasses 243, 320.1, and 325; and Class 514, subclass 44. If this group is elected, then the below sequence election requirement also is required.

II. Claim 2, drawn to methods of expression of polypeptides from polynucleotides, classified in Class 435, subclass 69.1. If this group is elected, then the below sequence election requirement also is required.

III. Claims 3-9, drawn to a transformed plant, classified in class 800, subclass 278. If this group is elected, then the below sequence election requirement also is required.

Sequence Election Requirement Applicable to All Groups:

In addition, each Group detailed above reads on patentably distinct sequences. Each sequence is patentably distinct because they are unrelated sequences, and a further restriction is applied to each Group. For an elected Group drawn to amino acid sequences, the Applicant(s) must further elect a single amino acid sequence. For an elected Group drawn to nucleic acid sequences, the Applicant(s) must elect a single nucleic acid sequence (See MPEP 803.04). It is noted that this is a restriction requirement to a single sequence and NOT a specie election requirement.

MPEP 803.04 states:

Art Unit: 1631

"Nucleotide sequences encoding different proteins are structurally distinct chemical compounds and are unrelated to one another. These sequences are thus deemed to normally constitute independent and distinct inventions with the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 121. Absent evidence to the contrary, each such nucleotide sequence is presumed to represent an independent and distinct invention, subject to a restriction requirement pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 121 and 37 CFR 1.141 et seq."

It has been determined that 1(ONE) sequence constitutes a reasonable number for examination purposes under the present conditions. At present the huge number of submissions of claims directed to various sequences, such as nucleic acids or polypeptides, is so large that the election of 1(one) sequence of this type is now deemed to be practically appropriate so as to not overwhelm the examination and search processes for such claims.

Examination will be restricted to only the elected sequence.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

The inventions of Groups I-III are independent inventions because they are directed to different chemical types regarding the critical limitations therein. For Group I, the critical feature is nucleic acid; for Group II, the critical feature is a polypeptide; for Group III, the critical feature is a transformed plant. It is acknowledged that various processing steps may cause a polypeptide of the above Group to be directed as to its synthesis by a polynucleotide of the above Group, however, the completely separate chemical types of the inventions of the nucleic acid, polypeptide, and transformed plant Groups supports the undue search burden if all were examined together. Additionally, polynucleotides and polypeptides have been most commonly, albeit not always, separately characterized and published in the Biochemical

Art Unit: 1631

literature, thus significantly adding to the search burden if examined together as compared to being searched separately. Also, it is pointed out that processing that may connect two Groups does not prevent them from being viewed as distinct because enough processing can result in producing any composition from any other composition if the processing is not limited as to additions, subtractions, enzyme action, etc. Inventions I and III are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the nucleic acid molecules of Group I could be used in another process, such as hybridization probes.

Inventions II and III are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the polypeptides of Group I could be used in another process, such as for Western blotting assays.

Thus, the three Groupings of I, II, and III are independent and/or distinct invention types for restriction purposes.

Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR § 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the

Art Unit: 1631

application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(h).

During a telephone conversation with Lawrence Lavin on 17 April 2002 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claim 1 and Seq ID NO. 1. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 2-9 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded to amend claim 1 to reflect election of species Seq ID No. 1.

Specification Objections

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01. See for example page 4.

Claims Rejections-35 USC 101

The pending claims have been reviewed in light of the Utility Examination Guidelines and Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1092-1111, Friday, January 5, 2001.

The examiner is using the following definitions in evaluating the claims for utility.

"Specific" - A utility that is *specific* to the subject matter claimed. This contrasts with a *general* utility that would be applicable to the broad class of the invention.

Art Unit: 1631

"Substantial" - A utility that defines a "real world" use. Utilities that require or constitute carrying out further research to identify or reasonably confirm a "real world" context of use are not substantial utilities.

"Credible" - Credibility is assessed from the perspective of one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the disclosure and any other evidence of record that is probative of the applicant's assertions. That is, the assertion is an inherently unbelievable undertaking or involves implausible scientific principles.

"Well-established" - a specific, substantial, and credible utility which is well known, immediately apparent, or implied by the specification's disclosure of the properties of a material, alone or taken with the knowledge of one skilled in the art.

35 U.S.C. § 101 reads as follows:

"Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title".

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention lacks patentable utility due to its not being supported by either specific and/or substantial utility or a well established utility.

The claimed nucleic acids are not supported by a specific asserted utility because the disclosed uses of these compositions are not specific and are generally applicable to any nucleic acid. The specification states that the nucleic acid compounds may be useful as markers, the isolation of polypeptides, hybridization probes, primers, the isolation of full-length cDNAs or genes, which would be used to make protein and optionally further usage for mapping and numerous other generic genetic engineering usages, such as antisense production. In fact, the

Art Unit: 1631

specification summarized modern biotechnology generally but never connects any of the specifically elected sequences to any particular or specific utility. This wishlist desire for a utility for the claimed sequences falls short of a readily available utility. These are non-specific uses that are applicable to nucleic acid(s) and/or proteins in general and not particular or specific to the nucleic acid being claimed. Furthermore, no disclosure of the actual protein that is encoded by Seq ID No. 1 is given. No established percent homology to a known sequence specific to Seq ID No. 1 is disclosed. Finally, there is no disclosure of an open reading frame or a proposed encoded protein pertaining to Seq ID No. 1.

Further, the claimed nucleic acids are not supported by a substantial utility because no substantial utility has been established for the claimed subject matter. For example, a nucleic acid may be utilized to obtain a protein. The protein could then be used in conducting research to functionally characterize the protein. The need for such research clearly indicates that the protein and/or its function is not disclosed as to a currently available or substantial utility. A starting material that can only be used to produce a final product does not have substantial asserted utility in those instances where the final product is not supported by a specific and substantial utility. In this case none of the proteins that are to be produced as final products resulting from processes involving claimed nucleic acid have asserted or identified specific and substantial utilities. The research contemplated by applicant(s) to characterize potential protein products, especially their biological activities, does not constitute a specific and substantial utility. Identifying and studying the properties of a protein itself or the mechanisms in which the protein is involved does not define a "real world" context or use. Similarly, the other listed and asserted utilities as summarized above or in the instant specification are neither substantial nor specific due to being generic in nature and applicable to a myriad of such compounds. Note,

Art Unit: 1631

because the claimed invention is not supported by a specific and substantial asserted utility for the reasons set forth above, credibility has not been assessed. Neither the specification as filed nor any art of record discloses or suggests any property or activity for the nucleic acid and/or protein compound(s) such that another non-asserted utility would be well established for the compounds.

It is noted that applicant has identified stated sequence similarity to the claimed sequences. However, no specific homologies are mentioned for instant Seq ID No. 1. Absent factual evidence, one skilled in the art would have reason to doubt that proposed sequence similarity alone would reasonably support the assertion that the biological activity of the claimed subject matter would be the same as that of the similar sequence. Furthermore, it is unclear whether the similar sequences identified in the prior art have actually been tested for the biological activity or whether this also is an asserted biological activity based upon sequence similarity to yet a different sequence. Note that it would have been well known in the art that sequence similarity does not reliably correlate to structural similarity and that structural similarity does not reliably result in similar or identical biological activities. For example, it would have been well known that even a single nucleotide or amino acid change or mutation could destroy the function of the biomolecule in many instances, albeit not in all cases. In the absence of factual evidence characterizing the structural and functional components of the biomolecule, the effects of these changes are largely unpredictable as to which ones will have a significant effect and which ones will be silent mutations having no effect. Several publications document the unpredictability of the relationship between sequence, structure, and function, although it is acknowledged that certain specific sequences have been found to be conserved in biomolecules having related function following a significant amount of further research. See

Art Unit: 1631

Attwood (Science, 290:471-473, 2000); Gerhold et al. (BioEssays, 18(12):973-981, 1996); Wells et al. (Journal of Leukocyte Biology, 61(5):545-550, 1997); and Russell et al. (Journal of Molecular Biology, 244:332-350, 1994). However, this level of factual evidence is absent here.

Claims Rejections-35 USC 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 1 is also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by a specific, substantial, and credible utility, or, alternatively, a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art would not know how to use the claimed invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The specification discloses SEQ ID NO: 1 which corresponds in some undefined way to cDNA/genomic DNA encoding plant species of protein/nucleic acid. SEQ ID NO: 1 per se meets the written description and enablement provisions of 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

However, claim 1 is directed to encompass gene sequences, and fragments of sequences of SEQ ID NO: 1, corresponding sequences from other species, mutated fragment sequences, allelic

Art Unit: 1631

variants, splice variants, and so forth. None of these additional sequences meet the written description provision of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. The specification provides insufficient written description to support the genus encompassed by the claim. This is a rejection based on a lack of WRITTEN DESCRIPTION.

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 1111, makes clear that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of *the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*." (See page 1117.) The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed." (See Vas-Cath at page 1116.)

With the exception of SEQ ID NO: 1, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed polynucleotides, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Furthermore, no disclosure of an open reading frame or encoded protein of Seq ID No. 1 is given, thereby causing serious questions regarding the description of the instant Seq ID. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it. The nucleic acid itself is required. See Fiers v. Revel, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (CAFC 1993) and Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd., 18 USPQ2d 1016. In Fiddes v. Baird, 30 USPQ2d 1481, 1483, claims directed to mammalian FGF's were found unpatentable due to lack of written description for the broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence.

Finally, University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co., 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1404, 1405 held that:

...To fulfill the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe an invention and do so in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can clearly conclude that "the inventor invented the claimed invention." Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc., 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (1997); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 1012, 10 USPQ2d 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (" [T]he description must clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [the inventor] invented what is claimed."). Thus, an applicant complies with the written description requirement "by

Art Unit: 1631

describing the invention, with all its claimed limitations, not that which makes it obvious," and by using "such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, formulas, etc., that set forth the claimed invention." *Lockwood* , 107 F.3d at 1572, 41 USPQ2d at 1966.

An adequate written description of a DNA, such as the cDNA of the recombinant plasmids and microorganisms of the '525 patent, "requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties," not a mere wish or plan for obtaining the claimed chemical invention. *Fiers v. Revel* , 984 F.2d 1164, 1171, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Accordingly, "an adequate written description of a DNA requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it; what is required is a description of the DNA itself." *Id.* at 1170, 25 USPQ2d at 1606.

The name cDNA is not itself a written description of that DNA; it conveys no distinguishing information concerning its identity. While the example provides a process for obtaining human insulin-encoding cDNA, there is no further information in the patent pertaining to that cDNA's relevant structural or physical characteristics; in other words, it thus does not describe human insulin cDNA. Describing a method of preparing a cDNA or even describing the protein that the cDNA encodes, as the example does, does not necessarily describe the cDNA itself. No sequence information indicating which nucleotides constitute human cDNA appears in the patent, as appears for rat cDNA in Example 5 of the patent. Accordingly, the specification does not provide a written description of the invention of claim 5.

Therefore, only SEQ ID NO: 1 but not the full breadth of the claims meet the written description provision of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. The species specifically disclosed are not representative of the genus because the genus is highly variant. Applicant is reminded that Vas-Cath makes clear that the written description provision of 35 USC 112 is severable from its enablement provision. (See page 1115.)

Claims Rejections-35 USC 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

Art Unit: 1631

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Genbank accession number U28047, wherein it comprises portions with greater than 10 contiguous identical nucleotides, thus meeting the limitation of “fragment” set forth in the claim.

Claim 1 is also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Genbank accession number I65799, wherein it comprises portions with greater than 10 contiguous identical nucleotides, thus meeting the limitation of “fragment” set forth in the claim.

Claim 1 is also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Genbank accession number Z27167, wherein it comprises portions with greater than 10 contiguous identical nucleotides, thus meeting the limitation of “fragment” set forth in the claim.

Claim 1 is also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Genbank accession number AA119201, wherein it comprises portions with greater than 10 contiguous identical nucleotides, thus meeting the limitation of “fragment” set forth in the claim.

Claim 1 is not allowed.

Inquiries



Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (See 37 CFR § 1.6(d)). The CM1 Fax Center number is either (703) 308-4242, or (703) 308-4028.

Art Unit: 1631

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lori A. Clow, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (703) 306-5439. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 10A.M. to 6P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael P. Woodward, Ph.D., can be reached on (703) 308-4028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to Patent Analyst, Bill Phillips, whose telephone number is (703) 305-3419, or to the Technical Center receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.


MARY K. ZEMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER


May 1, 2002

Lori A. Clow, Ph.D.

Art Unit 1631

